



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/598,703 | 09/08/2006 | Vasilis Ntziachristos | MGH-048AUS | 9134 |
| 22494 7590 12/16/2009 DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP SUITE 301A 354A TURNPIKE STREET CANTON, MA 02021-2714 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| BAKER, DAVID S | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2884 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 12/16/2009 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@dc-m.com
amk@dc-m.com

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/598,703 Examiner David S. Baker | Applicant(s) NTZIACHRISTOS ET AL. Art Unit 2884 |
|---|---|--|

All Participants:

(1) David S. Baker.

(2) Kermit Robinson.

Date of Interview: 9 December 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 N/A

Claims discussed:
 1, 7

Prior art documents discussed:
 US 6,304,771 B1, US 2003/0124244 A1

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner initiate an interview with the applicant to discuss prior art that reads on the amended claim limitations filed 15 October 2009. Additionally, a proposed examiner's amendment was discussed involving the incorporation of claim 7 into claim 1 which would overcome the current prior art of record. Mr. Robinson contacted the applicant with the proposed amended and is currently waiting for their response.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

/David P. Porta/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2884
 /David S Baker/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2884

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)